

REMARKS

This Amendment and Reply is intended to be completely responsive to the Final Office Action mailed October 13, 2009. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 38, 44 and 61 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 38-62 will remain pending in the present Application upon entry of this Amendment and Reply.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 5-19 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 38-62 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over European Published Patent Application No. EP 0846583 to Takeuch (“Takeuch”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,060,215 to Schoemann et al. (“Schoemann et al.”). This rejection should be withdrawn because Takeuch, whether taken alone or in any proper combination with Schoemann et al., fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed inventions.

For example, independent Claim 38 (as amended) recites a “method of making a molded article” comprising, among other elements, “providing a mold having a first mold section, a second mold section, and a shut-off member, the first mold section providing an A-surface of the molded article, the second mold section providing a B-surface of the molded article, the shut-off member disposed within the second mold section . . . wherein the A-surface of the molded article is defined by [a] first resin, [a] second resin, [a] third resin, an interface between the first resin and the second resin, and an interface between the first resin and the third resin.”

Also, independent Claim 44 (as amended) recites a “method of making a molded article” comprising, among other elements, “providing a mold having a first mold section, a second mold section, a first shut off member and a second shut-off member, the first mold section providing

an A-surface of the molded article, the second mold section providing a B-surface of the molded article, the shut-off members are disposed within the second mold section . . . wherein the A-surface of the molded article is defined by [a] first resin, [a] second resin, [a] third resin, an interface between the first resin and the second resin, and an interface between the first resin and the third resin.”

Further, independent Claim 61 (as amended) recites a “method of making a molded article” comprising, among other elements, “providing a mold having a first mold section, a second mold section, a first shut off member and a second shut-off member, the first mold section providing an A-surface of the molded article, the second mold section providing a B-surface of the molded article, the shut-off members are disposed within the second mold section . . . wherein the A-surface of the molded article is defined by [a] first resin, [a] second resin and an interface between the first resin and the second resin.”

Takeuch, whether taken alone or in any proper combination with Schoemann et al., fails to disclose, teach or suggest such methods. At the outset, Applicants wish to make it unmistakably clear that they do not agree to or acquiesce in the Examiner’s conclusion that Schoemann et al. is a viable reference in view of the declaration submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 and reserve the right to argue otherwise in future proceedings if necessary. In an effort to advance the prosecution of the present Application, Applicants have amended each of the independent claims to require the shut-off member(s) to be disposed within the second mold section (i.e., the mold section that provides a B-surface of the molded article). Neither, Takeuch nor Schoemann et al. disclose, teach or suggest such a mold configuration. In contrast, both Takeuch and Schoemann et al. disclose a mold configuration in which a shut-off member that is disposed within a mold section that defines an A-surface of the molded article. Specifically, Takeuch discloses a “parting plate 33” that is located in a “mold die 31” that provides a “main body 22” that defines an A-surface of a “door trim 21” (see, e.g., Figure 3). Similarly, Schoemann et al. discloses a “movable core 320” that is located in a “second mold portion 316” that provides an A-surface of the “trim component 300” (see, e.g., Figure 15). As such, Takeuch,

whether taken alone or in any proper combination with Schoemann et al., does not disclose, teach or suggest a method of making a molded article that includes positioning a shut-off member in a mold section that provides a B-surface of the molded article, as opposed to a mold section that provides an A-surface of the molded article, as now required by independent Claims 38, 44 and 61 (as amended).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 38, 44 and 61 because Takeuch, whether taken alone or in any proper combination with Schoemann et al., fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least one element of independent Claims 38, 44 and 61. Claims 39-43, which depend from independent Claim 38, Claims 45-60, which depend from independent Claim 44, and Claim 62, which depends from independent Claim 61, are allowable therewith for at least the same reasons set forth above without regard to the further patentable subject matter recited in such claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 38-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

* * *

Applicants respectfully submit that each and every pending rejection has been overcome, and that the present Application is in a condition for allowance. In particular, even when the elements of Applicants' claims, as discussed above, are given a broad construction and interpreted to cover equivalents, the cited references do not teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed subject matter. Favorable reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants respectfully put the Patent Office and all others on notice that all arguments, representations, and/or amendments contained herein are only applicable to the present Application and should not be considered when evaluating any other patent or patent application including any patents or patent applications which claim priority to this patent application and/or any patents or patent applications to which priority is claimed by this patent application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that another telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present Application. Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned attorney or agent at the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 4/12/2010

By /Adam M. Gustafson/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (414) 297-5652
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Adam M. Gustafson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,601